commercial relations, they go and meet their counterparts in various international conferences and find how regional co-operation within the multi-lateral framework is emerging and how they are benefited they recognise the need of it. They will aslo find the tremendous potential which we are having here.

I think, somebody in 1995 asked me how countries like Bhutan are having higher exports. Bhutan's import was Rs. 58 crores and export was Rs. 107 crores with India. Most respectfully I had to remind him that of the Rs. 107 crores imports, Rs. 97 crores was for the power purchase. We have established a power plant there and as per the agreement they are selling power to us.. It is not only that they are exporting power, in fact, they are helping us to overcome our own power crisis. I want more such power plants to be built in Bhutan, in Nepal and in Bangladesh. We should buy it so that we help them to expand their exports to India. They can also earn more foreign exchange from us and at the same time, we can improve our deficiencies in certain sectors. This is the type of approach we require and Pakistan is an important player in the whole scenario. In the morning somebody referred to China.. .*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, I would like to interrupt you for a minute. The Railway Minister has to lay a copy of the Railway Budget, Kindly take your seat.

THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS) 1997-98

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SATPAL MAHARAJ): Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Govemment of India for the year 1997-98, in respect of Railways.

SHRI V NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Madam, is it the Railway Budget of Bihar and Karnataka? We read the Budget. I am very sorry to say that the Railway Minister started various schemes in Bihar, but he has not given anything to other States. It has become a Bihar Budget...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री मती उर्मिला चिमनभाई पटेल: गुजरात,मध्यम प्रदेश और अन्या राज्यों को इम्पोर किया गया है ।....(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Don't waste time. Kindly take your seat.

Motion of Thanks on the President's Address contd.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Surely we will have some time to discuss the Railway Budget.

I was trying to point out why we require to take initiatives to improve our relationship with China or Pakistan. I am not making any comparison. I do not believe in competitive expenditure on defence. I do not believe in it The security concern does not necessarily depend on how much you spend on defence. It rather depends on what type of relationship you have built up. Some of the countries have strengthened their defence purely on this. I am not recommending that we should be under the protection of somebody. But at the same time we cannot go on competing with each other on defence expenditure. What has happened with regard to China? During the last visit of the Chinese Prime Minister to India, we agreed on the reduction of forces on border areas. I think this was the correct step that was taken and it was in conformity with a step we took after signing the 1993 agreement for maintaining peace and tranquillity in the border areas. As a result of this we have been able to open up three important trade routes which were suspended from 1959 onwards. Lepu leh and Shipke la and one more route is going to be

opened. Normal border trade is now going on. A lot of tension has been defused. We agree that it is not easy for us to determine and come to a solution in regard to the alignment of the McMahon line. That is very difficult. But the confidence building measures have been initiated and this is going to help. The tripartite agreement on which Mr. Gujral made a statement was initiated by me. I had signed the Memorandum of Understanding in 1995. This is another area of cooperation. Therefore, this type of approach has to be made. If we can build up good relations with China, if we can build up good relations with Russia which we already have, if we can build up good relations with Central Asia, if we can build up good relations with the SAARC countries, we will be able to utilise resources to our maximum advantage. Merely talking of globalisation is not going to help us. Yesterday, I gave you a figure in regard to direct foreign investment. In the year 1995, the total direct foreign investment was to the tune of 315 billion US dollars. Out of this, 205 billion US dollars were invested only in developed countries. Ninety-six billion US dollars were invested in China and other countries known as Asian Tigers. The balance of 38 billion US dollars were invested in the rest of the world. We should not forget that this is an unequal world. In 1995, 17 per cent of the world's population accounted for 81 per cent of the world's GDP Seventeen per cent of the population shared 81 per cent of the world's income, 68 per cent of the exports and 69 per cent of the imports. But what is the share of 20 per cent of the world population belonging to 40 countries which are described in World Bank and International Monetary Fund parleys as the lowest of the least developed countries? Their share was less than two per cent of gross world output, exports and imports. Therefore, we cannot expect to have any free lunch from anywhere. If we want to play the role of a major regional power, then we must build up our relationship with the countries con,

cerned in our areas and here I must say that the President's Address has given the correct direction and Government is continuing the policies which we were pursuing. Only one point and that is the last and thereafter, Madam, I will conclude.

Though it is, strictly speaking within the purview of the Commerce Minister, the Government as a whole will have to take note of. It was decided that the Foreign Minister will be the Co-Chairman of Indo-Russian Joint Commission. The Foreign Minister heads two important joint commissions, along with others. One is with China and one is with Russia. We committed that we should try to go back to the position of 1988 when our exports to Russia were Rs. 10,000 crores and the total trade with Russia was 28 per cent of our total international trade. That level of trade was accounted for with old Soviet Russia. Now we cannot just have that much. But there was an arrangement, an understanding that by 1997-98 we should reach four billion U.S. dollars. We were doing all right but in 1996-97 there has been a slippage, and that is why I am making this point that while discussing external relations as Foreign Minister -is the Co-Chairman of the inter-Governmental Commissions. We can have this axis in Central Asia, SAARC first, one circle, and outside that circle Central Alia China, Russia another circle. When I talk of SAARC I include Pakistan and when I talk of Central Asia surely Afghanistan is very much in my mind and I do hope with the initiatives taken it would be possible for us to bring back and restore peace in Afghanistan though the role of Pakistan and particularly supporting Taliban is not at all encouraging. I do hope that peace will come back to Afghanistan and with Afghanistan the new initiatives which we have taken to establish our contact with the Central Asia, the outer ring and outer circle should be the primary objective of ours. If we caa achieve that. Madam, then I do hope that it would be possible for us to have great advantages and benefits. Mutually it could be shared

by all the participants in this regions and with that I do hope that we can solve many of our problems and instead of just looking at West. All industrialised world, perhaps look at us if we could create a situation as they are now looking at the Asian Tigers. Ten years ago nobody bothered about them, 15 years ago they were of not much significance, but because of their economic strength, because of their gross domestic product, because of export turnover, because of their capacity to absorb technology the West is looking at them with respect and they will look at this region with respect if we grow. Potentialities are there, what is needed is bold initiatives discarding petty considerations. That is the responsibility of India, that instead of showing off as a big brother, really act as a big brother with a broad smile and with vision of future. Thank you, Madam Vice-Chairman, for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam Vice-Chairman, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address.

Yesterday, when I was in my party office, a news paper correspondent came to me and asked my opinion about the functioning of the democratic system. It appears that he met one of the leaders of the previous Central Government. He was formerly a Cabinet Minister also. It seems he issued a statement to the Press saying that unless the system of governance was changed, we would not be able to work for the betterment of the people. On the basis of this statement, that correspondent wanted -to know whether I had any comments to make on his observation and whether it was necessary for changing the system of governance in this country. I enquired from the correspondent as to what was the reaction of that leader when he said that there should be a change in the system of governance. I wanted to know what sort of a system that leader was advocating. He said that the system which that leader was advocating was the Presidential form of government. The leader was said to have felt that the Westminster model would not be suitable for a large country like India and if at all this country had to progress, not only on the economic front but on other fronts also, the Presidential form of government would become most important for us to emulate. Then I told the correspondent that the Presidential form of government. Various types of Presidential governments arc there elsewhere in the world. In Sri Lanka, we have got a system of Presidential government. In African countries, you have various types of Presidential governments. In France and Germany also, different Presidential forms'exist. So, unless we make it very clear as to which type of Presidential government we want to adopt, there is no use saying that we should have a different model than the Westminster model.

This point was referred to yesterday also. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee made this point. I am sorry I was not able to hear him completely. He said that the system got certain deficiencies. For example, he mentioned about the very large size of the Indian constituencies. On an average, each constituency has about 20 lakh voters. Assuming that each constituency, on an average, has only 10-12 lakh voters, even then it will be beyond the reach of an individual candidate to send cards to all of them. Mr. Mukherjee said that when the country became independent, the average voters in a parliamentary constituency were about 3-4 lakhs. My personal feeling is that it will be beyond the capacity of individual contestants to send cards to all the voters in a particular constituency, whether it is a parliamentary constituency or an assembly constituency. It is beyond the capacity of an individual contestant to send cards even if the voters in that particular constituency are at the same level as they used to be at the time of independence. It may perhaps be possible for Mr. Mukherjee to send cards to 3-4 lakh constituents. But it is difficult for me to send cards to all my voters, especially when the rate of cards is going up. today the Railway Minister

has presented his Budget. I don't know what he has done in the Budget because I have not read his proposals. I don't know whether he has increased the fares or reduced the fares. I don't actually know what he has done. But over a period of time, even sending of cards to four lakh voters will become difficult because even the Ministry of Communications may increase the cost of its services. It may increase the price of cards. The point is that in a country like India where you have very big constituencies, it is very difficult to adopt this system.

It may not be out of place if I narrate my own experience in this regard. In 1968, I went to Jamaica to attend a Commonwealth Conference. At that time, I was the Presiding Officer of the Tamil Nadu Assembly. Mr. Patil, who was also the Speaker of Lok Sabha, was one of the delegates. He was the Speaker of Maharashtra Assembly at that time. Both of us went to Jamaica. We met some of the Jamaican Parliamentarians and asked them about the strength of their parliamentary constituencies. They said, very strangely of course, that there might be, on an average, 5,800 to 6,000 voters in their constituencies. When we told them that our constituencies would have about 3-4 lakh voters, they expressed surprise and told us that the number of voters in all the constituencies might not be four lakhs. So, there is a difference. Jamaica is functioning under those conditions. The point is whether we should continue with the Westminster model and whether it is possible to continue with that system. My personal feeling is that it is not the system which matters. It is the people who manage the system which is very important. Unless the people are all right, no system can function well. Even if the system is the best of all, it cannot work well if the operators are bad and ineffective. I cannot say if the Presidential form of government is better than the Westminster model. Even if we assume that the Presidential form of government will be better for, us, then if the people who manage it are not efficient, even this system might fail. The situation will be like this. You have an excellent or. But the driver who drives it does not know how to drive it or drives it very badly, then what is blamed is the car, not the driver. You may remember, the Indian Arilines purchased some A-320 airbuses. Soon after the purchase, there was an accident near Bangalore involving one such aircraft. Because of this accident, almost all the aircraft which were purchased at that time were grounded. They were grounded for months together because of which the Indian Airlines went into a very difficult position. When somebody from the Press asked, "What went wrong? Was it because of the plane or' the pilot?" the pilot said that that was because of the plane. Ultimately it was found out that the difficulty was not with the plane but it was with the pilot who flew the plane and the accident had taken place.

The point I wish to mention here is that the persons who man the system, whether they are MLAs or MPs should be efficient. If you don't have proper persons to man the system, the system will falter and it will not work. The point I am making here is that even the Westminster system has not been tried properly by us-rthat is what I personally feel-because in India the persons who are dealing with the system are of a lower level, in legislatures—MLAs at the State level and MPs at the Central level. Then, we have Ministers at the Central as well as the State level. But what happened ultimately? Three or four days ago, I saw a news item from Madras. The hon. Minister, Mr. Venkataraman, is here and his party people are now ruling the Corporation of Madras. So, some of the Councillors complained to the Press that they have to work as Councillors of the Corporation of Chennai without getting any remuneration. They said that they were coming from middle-class and lower middle-class families and that before becoming Councillors they had been earning something like Rs. 50/- to Rs. lOfK-

per day. One of them bad said that he was earning about Rs. 200/- per day. He said, "Now, I have become a Councillor. But for becoming a Councillor, I had to spend some money. I had taken loans from outside and then only I had contested the election. Fortunately or unfortunately, I have become a Councillor now and I am paid Rs. 45/- as BATA per day when I attend the Council. I have to attend the Council on many days. Now I have to come by an auto-rickshaw because I have become a Councillor. I cannot ride a bicycle because I have to maintain my prestige. Previously, I was going on a bicycle. But if I go on a bicycle now, the people of my con-stitueny will ask me why I was riding a bicycle and they say it is better if I go in a car. The point is, I should at least go by an auto-rickshaw. Now, the auto-rickshaw is charging me Rs. 40/- as fare from my place to the Corporation. Then I again go back by auto-rickshaw and spend another forty rupees, which means a total fo Rs. 80/-. The amount that I get is Rs.45/- per day. Everyday, I am losing Rs.40. Not only that, I am also losing Rs.200/- that I was earning earlier. Then, I also have a loan which I have to repay. So, what is my position? I strongly recommend to the Chairman of the Corporation or the Mayor that some remuneration must be paid to me".

This is the statement that he actually made. What I would like to say is this. Even the other day somebody wrote in the Press. I think it was *The Economic Times.* Everybody had been complaining that MPs are getting a huge amount as salary. They are having a great life. But in that newspaper, the *Economic Times,* they wrote, "The MPs' salary is a joke". That was the heading.

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I am on a point of order. So far as the salary of an M.P. is concerned, it is very, very less as compared of that of an M.L.A.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Let us not differentiate between an M.L.A. and an M.P.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Swaminathan, I thought you were speaking on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, I am speaking about democracy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Please confine yourself to the subject concerned.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Rajasthan): He is speaking about democracy and hypocrisy.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, I am speaking about democracy. I am giving my argument. The building-blocks of democracy are these MLAs and MPs. I am not asking for myself because I am retiring very shortly. I am asking for others.

Now, I remember what hapened in the Legislative Council. I was there for a very long time, for three or four terms. One of the Members of the Legislative Council was talking about salaries. The present Chief Minister was the Chief Minister at that time also and he was there. He asked that Member, "Why are you talking about salaries of legislators? Talk something about your constituency." He said, "Sir, I am talking about my constituency". Then, the Chief Minister again intervened, "You should talk about your constituency and not about your salary." He again said, "Sir, I am talking about my constituency. My consituency is the MLAs who have elected me as an MLC. So, naturally I have to ask for more salary for them. So, I am talking only for my constituency." The point now I am raising is that it is a fundamental block. Unless you have a hypocritic system, this system will never work. You want honest people, you want people of integrity, you want probity, and then you pay an MLA or an MP Rs. 1,500/- as salary!

The Central Fifth Pay Commission has recommended that a Messenger should be paid at least Rs. 2,400. I am the Chairman of a Committee. If my Messenger is being paid Rs 2,400 then why am I being paid Rs. 1,500? Then a question was asked, "Are you not paid allowances?" We are paid allowances of about Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 4000. If an MP wants to go to his constituency, how should he go there? Should he walk in going to his constituency? There were days when the constituents used to attend on the MPs. But, nowadays, the MPs have to attend on the constituents. People come to me and I have to offer them cofee, food, etc. So, almost all the allowances an MP gets are spent away in this way. Somebody asked: Are you not having a big house? Yes, I am having a big house. I would like to bring it to the notice of the Vice-Chairman that the house in which I am residing has about 15 grounds and the present rate of a ground in Delhi is Rs. 1 crore. So, Rs. 15 crores worth of ground and an old house are being used by me. Every Minister and every collector is residing in a bon-galow. If you take the total thing and then say that this man is occupying a house worth Rs. 15 crores, that is nothing. I would be very happy if a smaller house is given to me to live in. It is just that somebody has to live in Delhi and you have given him a bungalow. This is what you have done.

Then they say that the MPs go by flight. How do I come from Kanyakumari and Madras? 1 cannot come by train every time. If I come by train, then three or four days will be wasted. So, the MPs have to come by flight only. They have to reside in Delhi for which they have been given a house here. Ten per cent of their salary is being taken away towards the licence fee. Somebody said that we have to compute all these things and charge income-tax on the MPs. How can you compute all these things? If you start computing all these things, then the MPs will not pay any income tax, the Income-tax Department will have to pay to the - MPs. So, that will be the position. This position is very lop-sided. It is so lop-sided that you are not giving adequate remunerations for the work we do. I am sorry to mention this anecdote—I don't think Members will mind this anecdote.

It. is somewhere said that if you throw peanuts, whom will you get? They said that it is only monkeys you will get. Then, there is another incident. Somebody went to a hotel. He paid about Rs. 30—35 as hotel rent. In the night he saw so many rats going here and there. The next morning he went to the proprietor and complained: "What type of hotel are you having? This is a hotel where I found rats were dancing in rooms." Then the proprietor said, "For the thirty-five rupees you paid, did you think that Apsaras will come and dance before you. Only rats will come." What I want to say is this. If you really want to run this system, then you really will have to pay to the people Then only the correct kind of people will come. If you don't pay adequately, then either you will have people who have got enormous money or the people who are very aristocratic. My grand-parents and parents earned that kind of money in Tamil Nadu. In the days of Justice Party, some of my relatives were there who were very rich people. That was the position before the land reforms. After that, we lost all that land and we don't have any wealth of that nature. Nowadays, we are complaining against them. My wife's grandfather was a Member of the Legislative Council representing the landed aristocracy. They were the people who had so much of land. Now, nobody has that much of wealth. They have lost that money in politics. Nowadays, people come to poli-tics either to pay the money or to earn the money. The election system itself is so bad that you have to spend several lakhs of rupees for winning an election. So, if you really want an ordinary person, a middle-class person or a professional to come—somebody was saying that professionals are not coming—earlier ad-vocates, chartered accountants, doctors,

etc., used to come to politics—then you should pay them adequately. That is what I want you to do. Nowadays, earning Rs. 30,000 is nothing for a good lawyer. Sometimes, a senior lawyer who comes to Madras earns one lakh rupees per day. A senior lawyer of Delhi for a particular day's appearance in the High Court is earning two-and-a-half lakhs of rupees. This is the kind of earning that they make.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Here you get two hundred rupees per day.

SHRl G: SWAMINATHAN: Yes, here we get two hundred rupees per day. That is the point. The whole income that a lawyer makes in a day will not be made by an MP throughout his full term. This is the difficulty we have. In four or five years the money may be about Rs. 60,000 but an advocate may make it in one day. I am only saying that if you really want the system to work, then you should have the best people and for that you have to pay. You should get professionals. Suppose, I am professional man, I should be able to come here if the payment is adequate.

The next point is not only the adequacy of payment but the support also should be adequate. Now there is no support given to MPs. Many of my friends here have been abroad. When I went to the USA, I was taken to a Senator's office and I found 21 people sitting there to help him. Here, when one is a Minister, he gets people. Suddenly when he becomes an MP, he does not have anybody. One needs help to write to people and to attend to people. When one is in Delhi, one needs help. How do we do all these without any support? We do not have even clerical support. With-out giving any support, or financial support, you want to run the system. Finally, after five years when you go back, you go bankrupt. This is what happens. Ulti-mately, people get disgusted Members are not able to devole their full time because of this. This .is what is happen-ing. They are not able to attend to work and that is why you are not able to get the proper fruit. This is what is happening in this country for the past 40—50 years. If you want the system to work, the Westminster system to work, you have to pay to the MPs as they are paid there. You have to give them adequate support as is given elsewhere. You cannot do it disjointedly you do not pay them but you want the system to work! You do not give any assistance. You also say that the bureaucracy has failed. You would also say that you want a different kind of system, a Presidential form of Govemment. Even in a Presidential form of Government, it is the same MPs and MLAs who would be working. This is what is going to happen here also. I personally feel, Madam, that the Govem-ment should think about all these things before thinking of changing the system. This is one thing I wanted to say.

Another important thing is that if you want a clean administration and probity in public life, this will come only if people are properly looked after. Then you can take strong action against the erring people. I wholeheartedly welcome the latest thing .of bringing the Lokpal Bill. It should see to it that the Prime Minister is also included in the Bill. I am very happy to find that now Rajya Sabha has decided to have an Ethics Committee. It is very important. It is there in many of the countries. In U.K., they had the Nolan Committee, they have the Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee here should look into whether the MPs and MLAs are properly behaving. In Tamil Nadu, those days, whenever a new MLA came to the Assembly, he was required to declare the assets he had. He was supposed to give the assets position when he retired. If somebody looks into the whole thing, he would come to know how much was there and how much he earned afterwards. Somebody there questions you. I feel that the creation of Lokpal and forming an Ethics Committee would do well to cleanse the system. I welcome this.

The third point I raise is with regard to efficiency of a system. There should be cleanliness in the system. The bureaucracy also should be clear. My personal feeling is that because the system has become corrupt, the bureaucracy has become corrupt. Suppose a Minister is corrupt, he would naturally like to have a corrupt person as his secretary. Otherwise, they will become incompatible. A clean Minister and a corrupt Secretary or a clean Secretary and a corrupt Minister will not go together. So, I would say that always the Minister would like to look for a bureaucrat who would go with him. Naturally if you become corrupt the system is made corrupt. I commend the strong financial support given to bureaucracy by the Fifth Pay Commission. Unless you do that people could not be asked to be very clean. I would like to mention that now-a-days, after the liberalisation has come, companies are giving handsome salaries to people. Even a second-level or a third-level management man is being paid Rs. 60,000 to Rs. 1 lakh. People are shifting from one company to another. It has become very difficult to get people to man companies now-a-days. You cannot be sure that the man would continue with that. An MDA of two years' standing is demanding Rs. 30,000 to 40,000.

3.00 P.M.

An MBA of a standing of five of six years is demanding Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 60,000. These people are being paid very handsomely. Lakhs and lakhs of rupees are being paid to them At the same time, the salaries of our Secretaries and Under Secretaries are very low in spite of the fact that they man the whole system. They have enormous powers but then-salaries are very low. It is very difficult for them to maintain themselves with these small salaries. If you do not pay them adequate salaries, they will not be able to do their job effectively. This is the position. I strongly recommend that the Govemment should take positive action on the recommendations of the Fifth Pay Commission. The Government should try' to implement it as early as possible. If you do not pay good salaries, efficient people will go away. Here I want to quote one anecdote, one example. As the Chairman of the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table, I had been to a Port Trust. It so happened that this Trust became a PSU and a circular was sent from the Ministry that they do not have more staff and unncessary staff should be given a Golden Handshake, etc. The Chairman of that PSU followed the advice of the Secretary of the Ministry and announced the Golden Hand-shake Policy and the amount that was to be paid under this scheme. Ultimately many people left the organisation. I met this gentleman two years ago when I went with a Committee there. But, this time I went with my own Committee. I asked him as to what happened during this intervening period of two years to the Golden Handshake Scheme about which he told he earlier. He said, "It so happened that I announed this scheme and many people went away." I said, "You should be very happy because unnecessary people have gone away." He said, "I have become very sad after this exercise." I said, "Why are you sad after this exercise?" He said, "Sir, good people have left under this scheme." I said, "Why should good people go away from you?" He said, "They are getting good salaries because they are good people." ...*{Interruptions)*... He said, "There are companies which have come forward to offer double the salary we are getting at present." So, these people 'get all the perks and benefits from the Government and then occupy better position elsewhere. He further said, "Sir, ray own junior is getting double my salary."

That man is now 50 yean old and is going to retire. He was with me for five years and has a very little experience but he is getting twice the salary that I get." 1 said, "Why do you not also go?" He said "Sir, my age prevents me because nobody takes me now." So* this is the

position. If you allow it go on the small number of good people that you have at present will also go away. You will have only those people with you who cannot go away. This is what that is going to happen. It is the Govemment which is going to suffer...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Swaminathan, I am sorry to interrupt you. ...*(Interruptions)*... Your party has been allotted 56 minutes. There are three other names from your party. ...*(Inter-ruptions)*...

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: I will speak for the entire time allotted to my party. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: I think every Member should contribute one minute from his time because he pleaded the case of the entire House. ...*(Interruptions)*... He pleaded the case of the MPs. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, I am not an economist. I am speaking on the basis of my experience and what happens around me. ...*(Interruptions)*... Dr. Dasgupta, you are an economist, but I am not an economist. ...*(Interruptions)*:.. Now, I would like to say a few words about the federal structure. In the President's Address a mention of the Common Minimum Programme has been made. Many kinds, of arguments are going on with regard to the stability of a coalition Govemment, whether it can continue or not, etc., etc. I personally feel that a coalition Govemment can continue. Some people say that there should be one-party Govemment; some people say that there should unitary Gov-emment. I hope my BJP friends will pardon me for saying so. My own feeling is that a coalition can exist if there is harmony among its members. Even within a party people are fighting with each other. It is not that even in a party everybody is your friend. When you become a politician what happens is that there are people in your own party who would contest against you. Outside the party also you' have to contest. It is very difficult to make friends even within a party. Generally I am very friendly, but it is very difficult for me to be friendly when I am in politics. The other day somebody said that whenever I went I made friends and asked me why in politics I could not make friends. They told me; it is becoming very difficult for me, because the Opposition does not believe in it. They feel that I nave come there to take away their Chair. So, they automatically become my enemies. And what happens within your party? The party man feels that tomorrow you will become a Minister and you let him down. So, he is also fighting. Fighting is going on in every political party. It is not as if you should join a political party because it is a monolith. Everybody is agreeing with everybody or.nobody is agreeing with anybody. This is what is happening in every political party and it has also started in intra-party and inter-party. But, this may not be the same thing with Marxist Party. The Marxist Party used to be a cohesive party. But now I have seen that every party. is splitting into two. Many of the parties have split into two. Even the Communist Party has split into two —CPI and CPI(M). The Congress Party has split into two. The ADMK has split into two. The DMK has split into three and the DK got into two. In every party you will find so many splinter groups. Why? Because nobody is agreeing on any thing within the party. Suppose the majority put some pressure, then the minority chunk in the party is going out. This is what is happening. Ultimately, it is not because a political party comes into power as a monolith. It will continue to be there, maybe, on its force. But, the experiment of coalition has to be conducted in our country because our country is composed of multiethnic groups. You see that you belong to a nation but at the same time, I also feel that I belong to that nation. I am a Tamilian. This kind of situation is also there in Canada. It is also there in USA. It was there in USSR. Recently, I had

been to USSR. They pressurised that everybody should be one. Ultimately what happened? Everybody broke away. If you pressurise people, then they will break away. Nobody can keep them together. It is the sense of the world that everybody has to be given a sort of leverage for them to live themselves according to their ethnic and historical background. My historical or ethnic background in Tamil Nadu goes back to nearly two thousand or three thousands years. Every culture in India is an ancient culture. If you talk about Shri Pranab Mukherjee, who is from West Bengal, their culture goes to one thousand or two thousand years old. It was something of a composite culture. In this kind of culture, if you really want to have a Central Government, then the Government has to be a Federal Government; otherwise, the States feel that they are not being properly looked aflter. At the same time, you cannot ask the people to drift away. If you allow them to drift away, then people witl go away and the country will collapse like Russia. So, the decentralisation is also necessary. For this, a system has to be evolved where there should be a sort of central control and also a kind of federal adjustment. Unless you have both forces—centripetal and centrifugal-—together in a certain kind of system, that system will not work. I personally feel that tomorrow there will only be two systems. One system is, a party, maybe the BJP, wants a unitary form of Government at the Centre. And another party wants a federal system of Government at the Centre. Congress friends will pardon me for saying that. I am saying this truth sincerely. In India, according to me, only two things will remain because India cannot be divided and the political parties cannot be divided on economic basis. Formerly, it was socialism *versus* capitalism. Now, who is a capitalist or who is a socialist is a big question because now, a capitalist is talking about socialism and a socialist is talking about capitalism. This is what is happening now. The Marxist Party is now talking about liberalisation. What they want is political control. In China there is a Marxist Party Govemment. The Marxist Party has got political control but the economy is controlled by the market economy. So, it has got a dual system. So, ultimately what will happen in this country is, every party, if they really want growth, has to accept liberalisation and market economy. And, then the people who want a sort of socialist economy and those people who are in the capitalist economy and want certain socialism like America, then in such conditions this system has to coalesce together. America is also talking about welfarism. It is not as if a capitalist economy is 100% socialist and a socialist economy is 100% socialist. Nowhere will you find that a capitalist is a part of Socialist and Socialist is a part of capitalist because welfarism is also there. The mid-day meal scheme is also there in U.S.A. So, you cannot have a political system in this country which will find socialism *versus* capitalism. It can no longer be there. Even under the Labour Government in U.K. you find a drift solely to conservatism. Conservatism is slowly drifting towards socialism.

Madam, my personal feeling is that hence-forth, there would be only two kinds of Governments, two kinds of parties, in this country; one party which wants to maintain the unitary control, as it is now, and another which wants federalism. There would be one party which is for unitary control...

SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL (Madhya Pradesh) We are for decentralisation.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: I do not know. You may talk about it. But I think you are for a centralised thing. You are for unitary control. *(Interruptions) yo*U are talking more of unity. You are talking more of centralisation. Maybe, you also want decentralisation. Then, as we say in Tamil Nadu, it is something like Ardhanareeswara. In our culture, Siva and Shakti are not separate. Siva is in Shakti and Shakti is in Siva. They are together. Politics is also becoming lik

that. I am happy that you are also talking of decentralisation.

SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL: We arc for decentralisation.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: But the impression among us, among the people *it*\ the South, is that you are more for centralisation. But on the other side, there are parties which talk about federalism.

Now, Madam, we have a coalition Government running the Govemment at the Centre. But why has this coalition Government become unstable? Why do the people think that it has become unstable? It is simply because of this reason. In your Commom Minimum Programme, you say that two-thirds of the people have voted against the communal forces; in other words, you say that they have voted for the secular forces. You say in your Common Minimum Programme that two-thirds of the people have voted for secularism, and that only one-third of the people have voted for the communal parties. By 'communal parties', your indication is towards the BJP and the Shiv Sena. You say that two-thirds of the people have voted against them, i.e. they have voted for you.

The point is: a polarisation of a different kind is taking place today. Earlier, it was the Congress versus all the other parties together. Now, it is the BJP versus all the other parties together. We have got to understand this clearly. This is, particularly, so after the Delhi elections. You may like it or you may not like it. That is a different matter altogether. The recent Punjab elections and the just-concluded Delhi elections have proved that the BJP is emerging as a force. You cannot simply brush it away by saying that you would not go into it. This is a fact. You cannot shut your eyes to it. Everybody has to take into account this fact. This is the result of anti-Con-gressism, All these years, the scenario was 'Congress versus all the over parties.' But what is happening now is that the congress is slowly becoming a sort of a provincial party. In such a situation, unless all the parties join together, unless all the secular forces join together, it would be very difficult for the secular forces. This is the problem.

The peculiar thing which is happening in the case of this thirteen-party Government is that the same parties which are inside the Government are, at the same time, attacking the Government outside. This is what is happening. I had raised this point in the House. One Member from the Marxist Party was attacking the Government. I asked him: 'you are a part of the Govemment; how do you attack the Government?' Actually, under the Westminister system of Government, either you are with the Government, or, you are against the Government. There is no qestion of your doing both the things. Either you are black, or, you are white. There is no question of any grey. That is why we have two benches here. There is no question of any grey area in this. This is our system. You sit on that side and I sit on this side. You support the Govern-ment. My duty is to oppose you and try to remove you from that side so that I can occupy that bench. This is the kind of system which has been evolved. There is the opposition and there is the ruling party. There cannot be any grey area in this.

How do these parties which have joined together to form this coalition Government behave? The parties are accepting certain things inside. But when they come out, they speak differently. Your Prime Minister himself is surprised at this kind of a thing. You cannot have the cake and eat it too. You want to have both. On the one hand, you want to take advantage of being in the Govemment and, on the other, you also want to take the advantage which is given to the opposition. You want to have both the advantages so that when the elections take place, you can say: 'I said so'. You may say that it was not your failure, but it was the failure of the Prime Minister, it

was the failure of the Ministers who were there in the Government. You may say that you were not there. You want to take the advantage of this as well as of that. It is not possible. Either you support the Government, or, you do not support it. If you are suporting the Government, whatever you have got to say, you say inside.

There is the example of a Minister. I wrote a letter in this regard. This gentleman, this particular Minister, is close to me. He accepts a certain proposition in the Cabinet. Then he comes out and says that he does not accept that proposition, that he does not accept what has been decided in the Cabinet. How can it be? After all, under the Cabinet form of Government, there is a joint responsibility. When you have accepted one thing in the Cabinet, you cannot object to it outside. But this is the kind of thins happening in this coalition Government. This, in fact, sends a wrong signal to the people in the country that these parties arc not supporting the Government, but they are against the Government.

Madam, the Congress Party has a strength of 140 odd Members. The coalition Government came to power only because the Congress party extended its support to it. Otherwise, these parties would not have been able to form the Government. Actually, what is your strength? In fact, the Janata Dal has a very small number. It has only 39-40 Members.

It is only because this major party, the Congress Party, is supporting this party. You have acceded to form the Government. If some persons say, "We are anti-BJP and also anti-Congress," how can they be anti-BJP and also anit-Congress at the same time? You can be anti-BJP, but you cannot be anti-Congress at the same time. The Congress Party is supporting you.

Then, the congress people also one day say that they are supporting you. Today the Congress President said, "We will not destabilise the Government." On another day they say, "Our support is issue-based." Everybody is confused about what you are doing and what you are not doing. So, the people are confused whether the coalition Government will be there or it will not be there. This is because of your own making or the making of the political parties within the Government creating confusion. The people who are supporting the Government are also creating confusion. So, if you really want a sort of federal system, you have to take all the secular parties, acceptable parties together with you and form a government. Then, you will have a government for a period of four, five years. Nobody wants elections nowadays. People have contested elections and have come to the Lok Sabha. Nobody wants another election. People want stability. If you want stability, all the people who are opposed to the BJP should join together and form a particular monolith government and support if from inside and from outside. Then, people will have faith in the coalition. Otherwise, nobody will have any faith in your coalition. So, ultimately, the system is failing because the building blocks are not all right, and the people who are supporting the system from within are completely vacillating and confusing the people. This is what I personally feel.

Another point that I may raise is regarding electoral reforms. I personally feci that if the system has to be strong, electoral reforms have to be enforced strongly. Unfortunately, several meetings on electoral reforms have taken place. I have been a Member of parliament during *tiki* last ten years or eleven years. I have attended so many meetings on electoral reforms. I have got big, big fiies on electoral reforms. But no reform worthwhile has come about. Only meeting are taking place. In the meeting, somebody objects, some party objects to some proposition made by- an earlier Government. Suddenly, they say, "We will look into it." The another meeting is held after 20 days or 30 days or one month or two months. Meanwhile, that Govemment

goes out and another Govemment comes to power. Several Governments went out cf power, and several other Governments came.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will also go-

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Everybody goes. Nobody is stable in this system. What is ultimately stable? What is the only stable thing? The only stable thing is that we want electoral reforms. Except that, nothing is stable. There are so many propositions. You get confused and confounded about the whole proposition.

The fundamental proposition is that the electorate is very big. Nobody can spend the required monkey nowadays. It is very true that a candidate spends Rs. 4o lakhs to Rs. SO lakhs for election from a parliamentary constitency. People spend Rs. SO lakhs to become a Member of Lok Sabha. Who can spend Rs. SO lakhs? How do you get that money? The money is not white money. May be, the political parties are spending it. May be, the candidates are spending it. They say, both the political party and the candidate together can spend that money. Whereform do the parties get money? The people are not giving money. You are getting money from somewhere. Everybody is an accomplice to this. I am not charging you. I am not charging myself. Everybody is there. You have to exist in this system. Democracy cannot exist in an vacuum. If one party goes out, another party has to come in. After one election, another election has to come. Ultimately, what happens? How do you get that money? Who is spending it? What is the accountability of the political parties? What is the accountability of the candidates? There is no accountability for any political party now. They say that you have to submit some accounts to the Election Commission. Then, the Income-Tax people will come and see who donated more than Rs. 10,000/-. Which Income-Tax Officer comes and see which account? The Supreme Court also - ordered the Congress Party to submit its accounts. Who submitted what accounts and for how many years? I want to know this. All the political parties who are giving all sensible advice to bureaucrats, sensible advice to business people to be honest, are basically dishonest. Nobody is looking into the whole thing. So, I personally feel that there should a clear system of accountability of political parties. Unless there is a clear system of accountability of the expenditure for elections by political parties and unless it is very clear that the person is spending white money and not black money. The people who will rule the roost will be smugglers and people with ill-gotton money will only rule the roost. This is what is happening Again, political parties have been the fulcrum of controlling the whole thing. What is the system of election in political parties? There is no election within some of the political parties. In Tamil Nadu, there had been no election in a major political party from the time of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. How without any election within a political party can we have democracy in the country? If you really want democracy? your political parties themselves have to be democratic. You have to have some mechanism by which you have a body like the Election Commission which ensures that the entire party has got elected members. Most of the members are bogus. They take hundreds and thousands of rupees and say that this man has become a leader and that man has become a deputy leader and so on. There should be some system which oversees the whole affair from the process of membership of the party to the regular electioneering in the party. This has to be mandatory. The present system is wrong. When the political parties are themselves wrong, how can we think they will bring about pure democracy in India? A political leader by name Uttaramani was a very respected man of our place. He said: If a lady commits something wrong, she can go the Ganga, bathe there and throw away her sins; but if the Ganga

itself sins, where do I go; There is proverb in Taminal to that effect.

The people who know Tamil will understand the meaning of this proverb. So, if the people do something wrong, the political party people can castigate them, but if the political party people themselves go wrong, where do I go? Which Ganga will cleane their sins? There is no Ganga available, because we arc the people who are giving the system. I personally feel that something radical has to be done. These kinds of platitudes will not take us anywhere. They will take us for some time, but the people will not be ready hereafter to accept us. The people have now become very wise. They have become anti-Government. Whichever party comes to power is thrown away in the next election, except in West Bengal, where is still continues.

I would now touch upon only one or two more points. The Sarkaria Commission spoke about Article 356 under the federal system. It was our party which welcomed its recommendations. Our erstwhile Chief Minister, Shri M.G. Ramachandran, gave a big statement on that also. He said: "We want a federal kind of a system and Article 356 has to be qualified." I would not say it has to be completely abolished. May be there is some difficulty, but Article 356 in the present form should not be imposed. So, we have to be very careful. I am glad that you have formed a Committee to look into the Sarkaria Commission's recommendations. I hope you will go into all the aspects of its to see that the real federal structure of the country is brought about. I welcome it. But, I want to say one thing. You have now revived the Inter-State Council. After its revival, I do not know why we are having the national Development Council, which is nothing but a body for the Planning Commission to discuss all the technical details with the Chief Ministers. If you have revived the Inter-State Council, wherein all the Chief Ministers of the States are already there and they can discuss all the matters, this National Development Council is superfluous. When the Inter-State Council was not functioningat the time of Shri V.P. Singh, he revived it and now we are having it. I feel you should have a re-look at the National Development Council, especially its role regarding the Planning Commission, becasue the Planning Commission has no Constitutional authority. It has now become a super-Government. It allots discretionary funds. What authority has the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission got? I am not against him, but the Planning Commission has no statutory background. Why should the Planning Commission, which has no Constitutional backing, allot discretionary funds? Why are we allowing it to continue in the liberalised system where you want indicative planning. It is high time thought about the status of the Planning Commission. It has to become indicative planning as it is in France. Then only you will be able to take the country forward. Merely by planning you will not get anything.

Now, I come to the point on poverty alleviation. Yesterday the Government announced its intention to give rice at reduced rates under the public distribution system. Under such a scheme they are issuing ration cards under three colours. I personally feel unless the country grows, as Mr. Pranab Mukherjee said, there is no point in all these systems. Unless the economy grows, there is no point in this system. I welcome all these things. But that is only a palliative. That would not cure the disease. When you have a fever, you take a paracetamol tablet. It would only dulls your fever. But the virus is there inside. That has to be cured first. So, unless he economy is managed properly, all these palliatives would not take you anywhere. That is what I personally feel. My personal feeling is that after this Government came into power, the economy is going haywire. I am very sorry to say that. Your export pertormance is becoming very sluggish

and inflation is going up. Somebody said that they were talking about a growth rate of 8.5 per cent or 9.5 per cent. *The Hindu* published a small cartoon depicting a man and a lady. The lady said, "8.5 per cent, is it the growth rate?" The man said, "No, it is not the growth rate. It is inflation which is going up." This is what is happening now. So, the inflation is going up.

Somebody said that people are becoming very conscious about money. Whichever house you go, they talk about money matters only. What else will they talk? Because every day is household, middle class families, lower middle class families have become very conscious of money. They are not able to adjust their budget. They are finding it very difficult. Almost every day, it is becoming a problem for middle class families. If somebody is earning Rs. 5,000 per month or Rs. 6,000 it is difficult for him to manage in this salary. In Chennai, one has to pay a rent of Rs. 1,500 or Rs. 2,000 per month for a small accommodation. The same is the case in Delhi and Mumbai also. Unless a person earns Rs. 10,000 per month, it is difficult for him to lead a decent life. What else will they talk? They always talk about money only. The entire family, husband, wife and children talk about money, how to reduce their expenditure and how to earn. This is the thing they are talking about. In this kind of a situation, the money looms large. That is why the economy takes such an important place.

I come from a place called Thanjavur. There were many land owners. They were leading a relaxed and comfortable life. They were talking about music cnly. Near Thiruvaiyuru, a place called Thyagapuram came up* wherein the people of that place sang songs, played music, talked about dance and culture only. They had leisure time. They had the advantage. Now, every family is talking about money matters. They have no time except to go to a cinema hall so that they can forget about money matters. That is the condition. My personal feeling is that the whole economy is getting into troublesome days. People are now asking: How long would it continue like this? What would happen to us? If we allow it to drift we would be in a serious position. Most probably you would be landing yourself into a serious problem as your predecessor Government did. You would get loans and you would give more to the people. You will give more subsidies, but no growth would be there. Ultimately, you can talk about the Asian Tigers. But the Asian Tigers would remain. What would be our rate of growth? It would be negligible. I am sorry to say that. Somebody said that 3.5 per cent is the growth rate. Then, another person said, "Why? That 3.5 per cent growth rate is Hindus," I do not know why they called it the Hindus rate of growth. Our BJP friends here should not mind. I do not know what is the growth rate of Hindutva.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA (Punjab): BJP is associated with lower growth rate.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Now they are flying high. They are growing at 8 per cent. Now, we can never call it the Hindu rate of growth. Definitely we I cannot call it as the BJP growth rate. Inflation is rising. That is the kind of situation we are in. You have to take a very strong view about it. You are giving ! food subsidy. You are giving this thing and that thing. There are no beds in hospitals. People are sufering. Medicines are not available. Though there is a scheme of Rs. 1 crore, most schools do not have anything. They don't have toilets. The girls' schools do not have toilets. They don't have a roof. Everybody knows all these things. These are the pitiable conditions under which our people are living. It is so bad that neither they have infrastructure nor they have schools, nor they have hospitals. Private people have come to build big hospitals because Govemment hospitals

are not able to man the system. Ultimately, the whole system is crumbling. I strongly feel that the Government should take a very strong view about the economy. If you are very complacent by merely giving something to some people, you would not be able to manage the affairs of the country.

I would like to say one thing. There is a lot of difference between China and India. In India we are talking about poverty alleviation. In China they are saying that getting rich is glorious. These two are somewhat contradictory. It is something like talking about night and light. You are talking about night, you are talking about poverty alleviation and how to eradicate it. But in China they are saying, how to become rich. Can we think about it? I would like to ask our Marxist friends. It is a positive thinking. ..*(Interruptions)*.. In China they are talking like that. I do not know what Deng has said.

.....that getting rich is glorious.

SHRI R.K. KUMAR: Deng has said whether the cat is black or white, so long as it catches mice, it is okay. So, whether it is socialism or capitalism or leftism, so long as it is for the good for the people it is good.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: He strongly believed that the end means everything, not the means. I strongly support it even though I am not a marxist. I feel that you have to glorify riches, you have to glorify wealth. Wealth production is more important than distribution. Distribution is very important. We have been distributing. But what? As Shri Pranab Mukherjee said unless you grow by seven, eight or nine per cent, how do you produce wealth? That is what he said yesterday.

Now, we have been criticising every day. If a person is a wealthy person, you say he is a capitalist. Suppose he makes profit; you say he is a profiteer and profiteering should be condemned. You say a man who makes wealth should be condemned. Then, who should be admired? When I went to Japan, I observed that people were very happy. There, the Government, the industrialists, the market economy, all are getting together to produce wealth. That is what they are doing. Ultimately, what is happening here? Even in our public sector, work culture is not there. Nobody works. How do you have the people who do not work? I will give you one example. Now, you are an M.P., in the Government. I am not talking about private people. I am talking about the Government. I am talking about the public sector. As the Chairman of the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table, I go to the public sector. I hear their owes. People are not working! As M.Ps., we have been given a gardener for every two houses. The gardener never reports. You make any complaint, he will not come. Nobody is able to control him. You pay and you are not able to get work!

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Mr. Swaminathan, your time is over Kindly conclude now.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Madam, have I spoken for one hour?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Almost.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: I will take only a few more minutes.

It may be very uncomfortable for Members. But I.have to say that because ultimately, we have the people and everybody should work. You pay well. I am for payment. But, at the same time, when you pay, they should perform their duty. If you say you can get the salary without doing your duty, nobody works That has become a culture now. I am not talking of private people. Private people make money. What happens in the public sector? What happens in the Government? I have seen, in Government offices, some people kniting If I *my ladics the* Hie Deputy Cha-rman will get wild,

Chairman may not like that. I have seen ladies knitting inside our offices. If You want, I will also take you to one place. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Kerala): You plead that the private sector is efficient. In the power sector, we are producing power for Rs. 1.18 in the private sector, you are producing one unit for Rs. 5/- which is efficient?

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: The private sector is also not efficient. In the private sector also, we are not able to get things done. I tell you from my own experience, the private sector is not at all better than the public sector. I will say that.

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री(उत्तर प्रदेश)**:** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,हमें कलकत्ता का अनुभव है । कलकतता इलेक्ट्रिक सप्लाई कारपोरेशन के समय चार-चार घंटे बत्ती जाती थी और अब जब से यह काम ज्योति बाबू ने गोयनका को दे दिया है तब से बिजली ठीक से चलती है । मालूम नहीं बालानन्दल जी किस की प्रशंसा कर रहे है ?

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: What I say is, you create work culture in this country. You have to get the capital. You have to create the work culture also. Mere capital will not create wealth. You have to have the machines, you have to have the people who work. You have to have the work culture. Whether it is a Member of Parliament, whether it is a bureaucrat, whether it is a worker, whether it is somebody, everybody has to work conscientiously for the amount he gets. Even as a Member of Parliament, I do not accept that I should get my salary if I do not come. I do not accept it. To get the salary, I have to be here for all the days together. Otherwise, I should not come here. That is responsibility. Whatever area you may be in, that is what I would say.

Finally, Madam, because my time is up, I will only say one thing. It is a strange thing. During the last 11 years, I have read many Addresses of Presidents to Parliament. I have never seen some passages being ruled out. This is the first time, Madam, I find that two sentences have been ruled out. They have also not been ruled out completely. I am able to see them. And somebody asked me, "How can you read a passage which has been ruled out?". Normally, here we say that the President has said something and then we discuss it. We refer to the President's Address for the purpose of our discussion. You are discussing something which the President has not stated in his Address. The hon. Members referred to something which as not been stated by the President in his Address. This point is very relevant for us to remember. "In the past, our inability to come to grips with these challenges was responsible for the failures." What do we mean by that? I do not know. Are you accusing the Congress Govemment for not doing it or are you trying to absolve yourself of these failures on the pretext that since the previous government had not done it, you are also not doing it or are you now speaking the truth? I would like to know the reaction of the Govern-ment on these points. Thank you for giving me time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Shri E. Balanandan.

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री : मेरा नाम पांचवां था कल मुझे यह बताया गया था । क्या हुआ,यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष(श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा)**:** आपका नाम आएगा इसके बाद ।

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: आएगा । लेकिन क्रम का क्या हुआ । कल मुझको बताया गया था कि मैं पांचवां वक्ता हूं । आज कैसे क्रम बदल गया । यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष(श्री मती कमला सिन्हा)**:** आएगा इनके बाद । आप यहीं सदन में उपस्थित रहें ।

SHRI E. BALANANDAN : Madam Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. A new situation has arisen that

during the last general elections, no single political party could get a majority. A fourteen-party combination came into being and they have formed the Government, on the basis of a Common Minimum Programme. It has been stated in the 'Common Minimum Programme' that secularism be given predominance. With your permission, Madam, I would like to quote a few lines from the 'Common Minimum Programme.' According to the 'Common Minimum Programme' of the United Front Government, "secularism means that there should be separation of State and religion. It also notes that it is this definition that has been accepted as correct by the Supreme Court in numerous decisions." So, Madam, a new Government came into being with the objective of keeping the secular polity of India intact. That is the fundamental position which is to be safeguarded for the unity of the country. After coming to power, the United Front Government have taken certain positive steps which were never taken by any other previous Government. For example, the steps taken by the Government for the revival of the Inter-State Council. The Inter-State Council has been revived and two meetings were held. It has discussed the re-commendations of the Sarkaria Commission which wanted to give more powers to the States. Many recommendations have been accepted. Also, a permanent Standing Committee has been appointed to consider giving more financial powers to the States. It will also consider as to how the working of Article 356 of the Constitution could be modified. This is a step in the right direction. India is a multilingual and multi-cultural nation in which every State should feel that it is free in India. *(Intenvptions)* Another important step was the election in Kashmir. The election in Kashmir has been conducted successfully. The Govemment of India have taken effective steps to curb terrorist activities in the State. In the case of Kashmir, the Govemment has completed the 'Economic Package' by which the people of Kashmir may be made to understand that the Government of India is taking steps to see that their economic conditions are improved. This is a correct step. Madam, another step taken by the Government which also needs attention is that in the northeastern States, even throughout the country, in the period after Independence, there was trouble, militants were fighting and there were armed actions. Now, the new Government has taken steps to see that the militancy is arrested, and the fight against those people will be continued. At the same time, the Government has assured them and has put forward proposals for economic development of the States, and also for infras-tructural development which is lacking in the northern States. Therefore, a new situation is developing in which the Central Govemment is taking note of the needs of the people and is trying to see that the development takes place throughout the nation, and especially the neglected areas are taken care of.

About Punjab elections, I don't want to comment more. Elections have been conducted peacefully.

On the question of social justice, in the Common Minimum Programme of the United Front Government, 33 percent reservation of seats for women in Parliament was promised. That is still to be implemented. During the last two Sessions of Parliament we could not do that. But the Govemment has now stated that they are going to legislate it this time.

Another announcement that was made in the Common Minimum Programme was that one-third of the jobs would be given tc women. They would be reserved for them. That is a step to be taken seriously and the Govemment should see that that promise is also implemented.

Regarding the question of Dalit Christians etc., as mentioned in the Common Minimum Programme, I don't want to elaborate much. The main thing is that the United Front Govemment has declared that secularism would be protected.

Then coming to the Economic Policy, while supporting the steps which I have stated earlier, I have my reservations and I want to mention them. My friend, Mr. Swaminathan, was saying that one party which is supporting the Government, is opposing its Economic Policy! He could not understand the logic. A 14-party combination or a 13-party combination means, parties are having different programmes; that is understood. On certain minimum things they agree; they also disagree on so many things. That is what is called a coalition. The President of India, in his Address, stated that the Indian Constitution provides that coalition Governments can exist, and work for the prosperity of the nation. It is mentioned in the President's Address. Though we also are participating in the 14-party United Front, we are supporting the Government from outside. We are supporting the Common Minimum Programme which is to be implemented for the benefit of the people, but we have our own reservations on certain policies of the Government. In the President's Address, in paragraphs 12 to 18, economic policies are explained. When I go through them, I am sorry to say, it seems just like a blue-print of World Bank and IMF plans. That is a serious statement I am making. An argument is being made by many that there is no way out; globalisation or liberalisation is the only way out; there is no other way out; therefore, we have to open up the economy and we have to invite all the multinationals etc. Before going into details, I must invite your attention, Madam, to one aspect. We are going to liberalise; we are going to globalise. For whom? What is the experience of the capitalist developed societies today? The Human Development Report of 1996 brings before us a picture of the de-veloped societies that despite having the advanced technolog.y at their disposal, they are also facing crises.

[The Vice-Chairman (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN) in the Chair.]

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: They claim that they are going to build a society, a crisis-free society. But unemployment is increasing in those countries. Our Finance Minister in his last Budget Speech said that we did not approve of a jobless growth model. In every developed society, whether it is England or Germany or America, unemployment is in-creasing in such a way that they do not find a solution. They are economically developed. If you take the year 1993, the total national income of the world was twenty-three trillion dollars. Out of that, the national income of developed countries was eighteen trillion dollars. The share of Third World countries, where 80% of the people live, is five trillion dollars. We are part of the Third World. Eighty per cent of the people could get only five trillion dollars as their share of national income. That means the income of Third World countries is less and their financial condition is absolutely bad. At the same time, the developed societies are financially forward and they are amassing wealth by squeezing the Third World countries by innumerable methods. Using the multinational mechanism of trade and financial transactions the Third World countries are being strangulated by them. That is what is in operation today. That is what they are doing in the case of India. Multinational agencies like World Bank, IMF, WTO, etc., are being used to squeeze the Third World countries. In the case of India also this mechanism is at work. The World Bank always supervises every step which we take. They say that our public sector should be privatised, it should be opened up. They have made this demand. Some people here claim that there is no other go. I can tell you the example of China and Vietnam. Some people say that they have also opened up. What happened in China? They have strengthened their public sector. They have not privatised it. The result is that China's national income growth is the highest in the world, 10%. That is what the World Bank report says. Now the second country which I can cite

as an example is a small country, Vietnam. The public sector is not privatised in that country too. The public sector has been strengthened and its national income, according to the World Bank report, is 7.1%. Therefore, there are. Ways. We have seen that. Some people's argument that there is no other go is absolutely groundless. Are we a small nation? We are one of the biggest countries in the world, second only to China. We have built our industrial infrastructure and we have gained many achievements. We can compete with others in the world in so many fields. I don't want to explain them. We are not a small countyr. We are a big country. We have gained much in the case of technology as well as in the case of industry and in many other areas. We have to protect them and further strengthen our economy. That should be our approach. We are talking of public sector. Somebody was saying that everybody should work. I also say that one who does not work should not eat. That is our philosophy. There is no dispute about it. If at all you want to live, you should work. But work should be provided. Without work how can you work? This is the only point. Therefore, there is no dispute on that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I cannot dispute on that from here.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: When we talk of public sector, we talk of 60 per cent of the industries. Out of the total number of Indian industries, 60 per cent of the industries i.e. 245 are public sector industries. Out of these 245 industries today 80 are listed as sick and nearly 60 have been referred to the BIFR. What are the remedies being sought by the Government? In a nutshell the policy of the Government is like this: Profitable public sector units are being privatised through disinvestment of shares; unprofitable public sector units are being closed; there is no fresh investment. This is the policy frame on which the Government is working. In a nutshell, it is privatisation of profits and nationalisation of losses. This is the position. This is the policy which the Govemment is pursuing. The Common Minimum Programme which I have quoted, has correctly said that self reliance is the national goal which nobody can barter. But what is being done is just the reverse. Self-reliance has been forgotten. All the multinationals have been given freedom to hold 70 per cent of the shares. The latest example is this. Till 1995 the Govemment carried out disinvestment of Rs. 10,000 crores. The latest report is multinationals are buying shares from the UTI. Multinationals have bought six lakh shares of Bharat Petroleum. They have bought 2,50,000 shares from the HPCL and 50,000 share's of the VSNL. What does it mean? The shares of public sector companies are being disinvested and multinational companies are purchasing these shares. For example, the UTI is selling shares to multinational companies. Finally, this company will be controlled by the multinationals. This is one thing. The Government of India is talking of a level playing ground. We are Indians. We have to look after the interests of Indians. We talk of a level playing ground. But with whom? The multinational companies which are here and our companies should have a level playing ground which I can understand. If they want to come here, they must be treated fairly. But it does not mean that Indian companies should be treated as second rate companies and foreign companies should be given preference over the Indian companies.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Mr. Balanandan, there are two more speakers from your party. One hour has been allotted to your party. You have already taken 24 minutes. Being the leader of your party, you can take your time. Now it depends upon you and the two other speakers.

SHRI R.K. KUMAR (Tamil Nadu): Sir, when you were speaking, we requested the Chair that our leader be allowed to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I am not a follower of his party; otherwise, I also would have supported him.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, the hon. Member has started speaking about Reliance. He may be allowed to speak.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: The public sector industry is owned by the Government of India. But the public sector industry is not given any preference. Take, for example, the Indian Airlines. Private companies are given profitable routes. More than 80 per cent of the unprofitable routes are run by Jhe Indian Airlines. Why? Where is the level playing ground? The private sector is being given preference. Why? I have letters from the Chambers of Indian Industry. They have requested the Government of India to take steps against dumping. Foreign companies are dumping foreign goods. They are selling these goods at less than the production cost. Complaints have been made against this. This is affecting our industry. The Steel Authority of India has appointed a committee to look into this. What do we mean by 'level playing ground'? Every country protects its own industries whether private or public. But here, even public sector industries are not given any money. The public sector is being discriminated against. This policy of the Government of India needs to be changed. We have to take steps to revive sick industries. About 79 textile mills are supposed to be sick. About 1,08,000 workers work in these mills. A package scheme has been agreed to by the Govemment of India. A tripartite agreement has been signed. Under this agreement, the Government will not be giving any money. The property of the mills will be sold and that money will be utilised for reviving these industries. If the Government of India does not do anything, 1,08,000 workers will become unemployed. The four textile research institutions in the country are the best not only in India but the world over. These institutions have said that these mills can be revived. Yet, no step has been taken in this direction. Another example is that of IDPL. I do not want to go into details. We have the infrastructure to manufacture basic medicines in the country. Our medicines are cheap. Now, this company is sick. But the Govemment of India is not thinking of reviving it. They are instead thinking of privatising it. Will this help us? Private management will only make profits and you and I will have to pay through our nose for these medicines. We wanted to have medicines at affordable prices; hence, this company was established in the public sector. Should we give up this idea? This will affect the health of the nation. Very important industries in the country have become sick.

4.00 P.M.

Say for example, JESSOP, Burn, Standard, MAMC, fertiliser companies like HFC, FCI, pharmaceutical industries etc. etc. All these companies have employed thousands of workers and they arc playing an important role in the production of industrial goods. I was telling you something with regard to discrimination. Between 1993-94 and 1994-95, 166 public sector companies in manufacturing and service sectors increased their turn-over by 18.5 per cent. But the Govemment of India hiked the excise duty to 26 per cent. Indian public sector companies increased their turn-over to 18 per cent. The Government of India increased the excise duty to 26 per cent. How can these companies work? In the Steel industry, tariff has been cut down while hiking the excise duty. In the last five years, that is during the period of reforms, excise on steel has been increased to 300 per cent. Therefore, can the Steel Industry survive? So our national interest cannot be protected using these methods. That is why I. told you, Sir, that this blueprint policy which is being narrated in the

Presidential Address is a blueprint given by the World Bank and IMF. I want the Government of India to give up this policy. The inevitability of this policy is a wrong thing as I told you earlier. On the excise duty front, One simple example I want to cite. In the bidi industry, nearly one crore or 90 lakh workers are employed and excise duty reduction has been granted to small cigarettes. The result is that thousands and thousands of bidi workers are becoming unemployed. In the Common Minimum Programme which you have agreed to, employment has to be protected. Whose employment? Bidi industry employment is not being protected. Also the customs duty reduction is affecting industries in Kerala. Customs duty reduction is affecting the Fertilizer industry and also the minerals and metals industry and many other industries in the State. Therefore, Sir, this policy needs thorough revision and I request the United Front Government to see that this policy framework which we are following is to be given up.

What is the position in the oil sector? The President has said that Rs. 15,500 crores will be the deficit in the Oil Pool Account. The oil import bill by the end of this year will be Rs. 33,000 crores and the oil requirement is growing at 5.5 per cent per annum. Last year it increased by 10 per cent. What is the remedy sought for? You know our earlier Petroleum Minister. The 30 oil-fields which we have found, which we have worked, which were producing oil, have been given to the private sector. Out of 30 million tonnes of oil production, the private sector could produce only 0.66 million tonnes. That is, they could not produce even one million tonnes. So production cannot be increased by privatising. I have examples of these private sector companies. In the oil sector the prices are going up, expenditure is going up. We have to pay international prices for the oil which is produced by the private sector and which was being produced by the public sector at half the rate or less than half. Therefore, what does privatising oil mean? We have to go for imported oil.

Importing oil means, as I said, we have to find Rs. 33,000 crores. How can we do this? A method was followed earlier when the Govemment of India achieved independence. We wanted to produce oil. All those big oil companies were there in the British days. They said that there was no oil in India. That was the position they took. We have achieved at least 73% self-reliance in oil sector. But, now it is going down. Year after year oil self-sufficiency is coming down. Therefore, the Government of India cannot rely upon the private sector for meeting its oil requirements because in today's conditions trade profits has become very important. These private companies are interested in profit alone. This is the basic thing.

Now, I come to another sector i.e., power sector. We must get energy, which we want for our development purposes, at the cheapest possible rate. That is the attempt. If you allow the private sector, they will be hiking prices. The result will be that energy will be more costly and there will be high—cost economy. India will always be in debt. We have always to rely on the foreign multi-nationals. This is one aspect and I do not want to explain it any further. In the Eight-Five Year Plan we had a plan to produce 33,800 MW, but we could produce only less than 18,000 MW, That is because the policy changed. The Government said that there was no money for investment in the power sector. My honourable friend, Mr. Manmohan Singh, had gone on record recently; it was wrong on his part to curtial the investment of public sector in the power sector. That is why, we are facing a crisis today. So, the point today is, Sir, that some other Minister may say some other policy was wrong after some time. But, the power sector has created a very serious situation in the country. Large parts of the country face blackouts, load-shedding, power-cuts and, now the prescription of the World Bank is: The Govemment of india should go in

for further privatisation of the power sector, inviting multinationals in a very big way. I do not want to go into the details. Earlier, we were not able to produce one unit of power at Rs. 1.18. These big companies efficient companies, technologically sound companies, will be charging Rs. 4-5 per unit. The result would be that the total development of the country is going to be seriously affected because of power shortage. They said that within 3-4 years the power companies would be able to start' production. But, nothing has started even today. In the power sector we have established one of the best companies in power engineering. BHEL can produce power machines of world standards at the cheapest price. They can meet our demand also, if properly nursed. We can have our own power machines for production of power. One power machine will stand for 60 to 100 years. But the capitalist countries have no market for their power machines. They are hunting for markets and, therefore, are trying to enter into the Indian market. They are imposing so many conditions in order to facilitate their entry into the Indian market so that they can dominate the power sector. If you don't understand this you will not be able to understand anything about power. Therefore, the point is that in the power sector we are going to face a very serious crisis which is a creation of the Government of India. Therefore, I want the new Government to change its power policy; otherwise, we will be in great trouble. Another sector I want to touch upon is the insurance sector. What is the position of the Indian insurance sector? Economic liberalisation and extending invitation to the multinationals to enter the financial sector are some of the prescriptions suggested by the President in his Address. Privatisation of the insurance sector appears to be on the UF Government's agenda. What are the arguments in favour of or against privatisation of the insurance sector? What is the position of the Indian Isurance sector today? The growth rate of the Life Insurance Corporation of India is 20% per annum. No industry anywhere in the world has such a high growth rate. The claim settlement rate is 97%, i.e., three per cent less than hundred per cent. This is a world record. Today, it is the LIC and the GIC which are lending resources to the Government of India to the tune of Rs. 20,000 crores per annum. It means, in a five-year period, these are extending one lakh crores of developmental assistance to the Government of India. In every aspect, even if you go to the minutest aspect, these are the world's first. GIC is the world's first. LIC is the world's first. Now, you want them to compete with the multinationals. What is the competition? With whom is the competition? Competition here implies that the money which these companies mobilise should be given to the foreign multinationals and they will give us the loans. It is wonderful. Our money will be taken away by them. What is this competition? Are they efficient? The settlement rate of GIC is 74% and the international standard is 54%. Then, how can these multinational companies compete with our companies? All this is humbug. I must say this. Therefore, the privatisation efforts should be given up. I don't want to say anything about our banking system. Same is the story in respect of our banking system. Before the nationalisation of banks, they were breaking up almost everyday and the people used to lose their money. In such circumstances, people had no confidence in the banking system. After nationalisation, people are depositing their savings in the banks without any problem. Today, banking system has grown into a very big structure, I don't want to go into other details. Before I conclude my speech, I would like to make two-three small points. One is that the Government of India had taken certain steps to normalise relations with our neighbours. This is an important step. For example, our relations with

China have improved significantly. It is a welcome development. Another thing is, we have entered into agreements with Bangladesh on sharing of Ganga waters. We were able to find a solution to this long-standing problem with Bangladesh. It was an historic event. We have also made some arrangements with Bhutan. Now, the Government of India says that we would like to hold negotiations with Pakistan on the basis of the Simla Agreement.

SHRI VISHNU KANT SHASTRI: Sir, there is no Cabinet Minister in the House. How can the House be allowed to run without there being a Cabinet Minister?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SATPAUI MAHARAJ): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Cabinet Minister is coming in a moment.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Sir, various steps taken by the Government of India to normalise and improve India's relations with its neighbours have their own important consequences. If tensions in the region decrease, bilateral relations would improve, trade and commerce would improve which will help us in our progress. I must mention this here.

Now, I would like to deal with the problems of the working class.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, see the seriousness of this Government. When a senior Member of this house is speaking, there is no Cabinet Minister to hear him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): As per the conventions, a Cabinet Minister has to be present in Rajya Sabha. If one Cabinet Minister could not be present in the House, then some other Cabinet Minister can be there in the House. Hon. Members, Shri Janeshwar Mishra, is here only. He has been sitting here since morning. I think he must have gone out for relaxation. I think he should be supported by another Cabinet Minister because he cannot sit in the House all through. It will be difficult for anybody to sit in the House all through.

SHRI SATPAUI MAHARAJ: Sir, the Cabinet Minister is coming.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Mr. Mishra has gone out just now. He has been sitting here since morning. I think he should be supported by another Cabinet Minister because he also needs some relaxation. He cannot be here for 2-3 hours continuously. But the practice in Rajya Sabha is that a Cabinet Minister is always present in the House.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Sir, the Government promised a Bill on trade union recognition. It has not come up with such a Bill so far. Lakhs and lakhs of workers are going to go on a nationwide strike on April 2, 1997. They are fbrced to go on a strike on April 2, 1997 to protect the interests of the workers. In the circumstances, I request the Government of India to change its policy. A new development strategy needs to be adopted by the UF Govemment if it has to complete its full term. It is my hope.

With these words, I thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity.

DR. M. ARAM (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

May I first refer to paragraph 6 in the President's Address which is about Panchayati Raj institutions and Nagarpalikas, which is rightly described as an ideal framework for planning, formulating and executing programme fot economic development and social justice. Sir, this Parliament unanimously passed the Constitution (73rd) Amendment in December, 1992 and it came into force on 24th of April, 1993. This Amendment was a historic step, indeed a revolutionary step towards a decentralised polity. It was the fulfilment

of the Gandhian vision and with the passage of law in the last session of Parliament, Panchayati Raj has now been extended to all the scheduled and tribal areas in the country. Thus, the entire country is covered by Panchayati Raj. I congratulate the Government for expediting this historic change initiated by the former Government.

Sir, today we have in the country more than two lakh elected Panchayats functioning as units of self-government, about 10 lakhs of women members and Presidents, as Shrimati Kamla Sinha pointed out, more than 5,000 elected Panchayat Samitis functioning in as many Blocks and about 500 elected Zila Panchayat Presidents. This is a mighty upsurge of democracy at the grassroots. It is indeed an upsurge of woman's power, Stri Shakti, and also an upsurge of the weaker section of the society and a great march towards social justice.

Sir, while we are very proud about this tremendous political transformation which is sweeping the country, the length and breadth of the country, it is a matter of profound regret that in only one State—that great and ancient State of our country—the State of Bihar, the Panchayat elections are yet to be held and only two days, ago, the Supreme Court dissol-ved all the 12,000 Panchayats in Bihar, the Gram Panchayats for which the elec-tions were not held since 1978, for a period of twenty years. I hope Bihar also will join the rest of the country and hold the Panchayat elections very soon and preserve the fair name of that great State.

Sir, under article 243(a) of the 73rd Amendment, the Gram Sabha has been made an important basic institution. It has been given the pride of place. Even day before yesterday, a reference was made not only to Gram Panchayats but also to the Gram Sabha. The Gram Sabha is the pivotal body. It is like a village parliament to function something like a State Legislature where all the voting members of the village community are members. I am very happy to say that the Tamil Nadu Panchayat Act, 1994 has a chapter on Gram Sabha which is an example to the rest of the country. The functions, duties and powers of the Gram Sabha have been spelt out. A former Minister, hon. Nedunchezhian told me a few years ago, "We know about Gram Panchayats, but we don't know much about Gram Sabhas. What do the Gram Sabhas do? So, I answered that in the Sarvodaya Movement, in the Gandhian Movement and in the. Bhoodan-Gramdan Movement we had great experience about Gram Sabha and we would supply and we did supply a model Bill, and that chapter on Gram Sabha was taken almost in-toto into the State Act.

Sir, since the new Gram Sabha is a new concept and yet to be operationalised, this democratic institution at the grass-roots, I would suggest to the Ministry of Rural Areas and Development, to the Hon'ble Minister, to set up a special task-force, a working group, which can go into the entire gamut of the functioning and powers of the Gram Sabha. The National Institute of Rural Development, NIRD, has helped at every stage in pioneering this movement for Panchayati Raj and they could be involved in this pilot project.

Sir, since the Panchayats are units of self-government, they cannot function effectively unless they have powers, special political powers and also financial resources. Now, the President's Address refers to the fact that the Government is seized of the fact that both powers and resources will be devolved by the State Governments to the Panchayat system. According to the eleventh Schedule which goes with the 73rd Amendment, 29 subjects have been assigned to Panchayats and if these subjects are to be effectively implemented by the Panchayat system, certainly, both powers and resources should be devolved. So far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, where I live, I was very glad to hear that the hon. Chief Minister has promised that a new Bill will be brought

in the State Assembly enabling this transfer of powers to the Panchayats.

Sir, the State Finance Commissions which are Constitutional bodies have been functioning in various States of the country. The experience has been mixed. In some State, the State Finance Commissions have functioned effectively and the State Governments have accepted the recommendations, whereas in some other States, it is not so. I do hope that the recommendations made recently-I am talking about Tamil Nadu—by the State Finance Commission will be accepted in toto. Those are modest recommendations.

The Panchayats and the Nagarpalikas have a rightful share in the total tax revenues of the State, particularly in the elastic and buoyant taxes like the Sales Tax and they should have their share. The State Finance Commission in Tamil Nadu had recommended only about 10 per cent share for these decentralised institutions. This is very modest, but certainly, this should be upgraded. I quite understand the fact that the State Governments are somewhat reluctant in transferring powers and resources to the grass-roots Panchayat bodies because the State Governments themselves would appreciate that there should be a similar devolution of power and financial resources from the Federal Government, the Central Government to the State Governments. Therefore, I welcome the mention made in the President's Address that the Government is working towards devolution of financial powers to the States in accordance with the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission.

Sir, the Panchayati Raj institutions certainly need training not only for the elected leaders but also for the officials. I think, the officials, particularly at the lower levels have to appreciate the fact that the present Panchayati Raj is no longer the system that it used to be. It is a unit of self-governance. They are now constitutional authorities. The Presidents of NagarpaUkss are to he treated in a defferent way than they used to be in the past. It means reorientation on the part of officials at die" lower-Jevels towards. ©letted leaders. There is an emergence of women leaders with 33% reservation and leaders from weaker sections.

I hail from Tirunelveli district which is the southernmost part of Tamil Nadu. Many upper caste people were holding the sway for generations together. Thirunelveli municipality is now headed by a Harijan lady, which is a marvellous thing today, who is now presiding over the destiny of the entire city of Thirunelveli and Palayamkottai. This kind of a veritable silent social revolution has been brought about by the 73rd Amendment. Therefore, a change of attitude on the part of everyone is very necessary towards the new leadership that has emerged both from women and from weaker sections. There is one more point before I end speaking on the Panchayati Raj institutions and Nagarpalikas issue. The Panchayati Raj institutions cannot function effectively unless there is a systematic and scientific micro-level planning. The elder statesman, Shri C. Subramaniam said that every Panchayat Samiti should have its own micro-level planning with local resources and skills available. We do have centres of micro-level planning in the National Institute of Rural Development and Gandhigram Rural University, of which I was the Vice-Chancellor some years ago. I had the great privilege of initiating a course in micro-level planning. I would suggest that the entire university system with 224 universities including the deemed universities and agricultural universities should be involved in the process of micro-level planning. I hope, the UGC will take a lead in this respect. I particularly congratulate the Indira Gandhi Open University and its very imaginative and dynamic Vice-Chancellor, who has offered new courses in distant education, particularly for the Panchayati leadership.

Sir, may I now turn to paragraph 26 in the President's Address which refers to the Common Minimum Programme and

also the seven basic minimum services? The seven basic minimum services are drinking water, primary health, universal primary education, public housing, link roads, nutritional support to children and public distribution system with focus on the poor. Sir, I would refer to only two things. Education is my area of speciality. The universal elementary education, which is a constitutional directive, has eluded us all these fifty years since independence. This is a sad fact and a serious fact. According to 1991 Census, in our country where scholarship and learning are respected, the literacy rate is only 51.12%. We asked the Education Secretary as to what could be the level in 1997. He said that it would be 55%. The present Government wants to achieve hundred per cent literacy by 2000. If this is difficult, by 2005 we propose to achieve it. This is a baffling issue and a common issue. Every single

favourable factor must be taken advantage of. The new favourable factors are, the emergence of women leadership at the grass roots level, the emergence of Panchayati leadership and the micro-level planning. These can help in achieving hundred per cent literacy, hundred percent enrolment in schools with zero drop-cut rate so that the Constitutional obligation is fulfilled. Indeed we have a right start all over the country. There are many villages and blocks which have achieved this Constitutional directive. But, the country as a whole has not done so. Whereas we have micro successes around the country, we are far away from a macro national fulfilment of this. Sir, in the eleventh Schedule attached to the 73rd Amendment, there are five subjects amongst the 29 subjects, item 17—elementary education, including middle school; item 18—vocational education and technical training; item 19—adult and non-formal education; item 20—libraries; and, item 21—cultural activities. All these five subjects directly bear upon education and culture. Now they have been transferred to Panchayats and Nagarpalikas. Therefore, they should be implemented and operationalised in a successful way so that we march towards the fulfilment of the Constitutional directive. Sir, the Education Secretary has mentioned that a district-specific approach may give us greater results as it happened in the case of food production where the district-specific approach gave us good results. Similarly, in the case of literacy and education also, it will bring good results ....*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G.' SWAMINATHAN): You have already taken 15 minutes....*(Interruptions)*...

DR. M. ARAM: I am finishing, Sir. I appreciate many things in the President's Address. But I am puzzled to note that the President's Address did not mention what the Common Minimum Programme mentions very clearly about education and human resource development. One of the paras of the Common Minimum Programme talks about it and I am quoting, "Six per cent of the nation's GDP will be earmarked for education. This will be achieved by year 2000." This was the Education Policy of the previous Government. But the President's Address does not mention for one reason or the other this very important policy position that six per cent of the GDP will be progressively allotted towards education. Was it an oversight or was it an international omission? What actually is it? I would like to stress with full force at my command that this policy position of allotting six per cent of the GDP towards education in a progressive way should by all means be pursued by the present Govemment. The Parliament should adopt a resolution that the education should received six per cent of the GDP. It should be a consensual decision by the Parliament. If we do so, we will have resources for primary education which certainly has a high priority. I entirely endorse what the Common Minimum Programme says, that 50 per cent of this fund will go to primary education. Primary education has a high priority but it does not mean that other levels of education should be

starved of funds. I think higher education is extremely important. We have a wonderful university system in our country. We have 224 universities and more than 8,000 colleges with more than 50 lakh students. We have a vibrant youth force in these institutions. Certainly they should also be given enough support.

Sir, I am coming to the last point and then I will conclude. Towards the end of the President's Address in the last two paragraphs, in the peroration, the Presi dent rightly refers to the 50th anniversary of our Independence and to the future destiny of our country. I quote, "Our freedom struggle was unique in the his tory of the world, based as it was on non violence." Indeed this was the most crea tive contribution that India has made to the evolution of human history in the 20th Century and the respect in which India is held around the world is because of this non-violent successful struggle for Independence and later because of the application of this principle to the inter national relations through Panchasheel and various other policies that this coun try and its Prime Ministers have given to the world. Sir, we had the great, good fortune of a leader, a very rare leader, who is described as the tallest Indian of the 20th century, the Father of the Na tion, Mahatma Gandhi ..... about whom Albert Einstein had said, "generations to come will scarcely believe that such a one as this in flesh and blood ever walked upon this earth." I had the privilege to meet Einstein and have an hour-long talk with him on my post-doctoral thesis about 'Creative thinking.' I still remember Einstein's own words which ring in my ears with his guttural German English. He said, "Mahatma Gandhi (he called Mahatma Gandhi as 'Mahatma'), was the greatest political genius of the modern world"; he paused and added, "The power of his ideas is bound to grow in the years to come. The Gandhian ideas belong to the future, the years to come. The idea of non-violence, the idea of Satyagraha, the ideas of resolving disputes through peaceful means, the idea of Shanti Sena, the idea of Sarvodaya, the various ideas that Mahatma Gandhi gave birth to and launched into the world, not only into our country. In Sri Lanka, Survodaya succeeded in a big way. We honoured a great national leader of that country, Dr. Ariaratne, to whom we gave, on the first of January last, the Gandhi Peace Prize. So, India should continue, as far as possible, with all the limitations and compulsion of circumstances to go in that direction. Panchayati Raj is certainly one mighty step in that direction of a decentralised polity where power resides with the people and we have a participatory democracy. May I close with the grand vision of Mahatma Gandhi, the vision in his beautiful words which Mahatma Gandhi himself said, I quote, "In this structure,"—the social structure he thought of—"composed of innumerable villages, there will be ever-widening never ascending circles; life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. It will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the village ready to perish for the circle of villages till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral parts." This vision may be Utopian. Perhaps, it is. We may never concretise and may never achieve this vision; but nevertheless, it is a mystic vision, it is an inspiring vision, it is a vision of a society, truly equal and a nonviolent decentralised society. This can serve as a guiding star. As we move into the 21st century, into the third million-ism, India may fulfil her destiny—a national destiny, as a non-violent nation, as a truly democratic nation with peace and justice, justice to all and a giant power for global peace and India may emerge as an unmitigated blessing for the entire mankind. Thank you.

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी,महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी का भाषण वास्तव में भानुमती के कुनबे वाले दलों का जो मत हैं,उनकी जो राजनीतिक दृष्टि है,उसका परिचायक है । उसके ऊपर चर्चा करने के

पहले में एक बात आपके माध्यम से सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूं । वे तमाम लोग जो भा.ज.पा.विरोध के आधार पर और सत्ता के लोभ के आधार पर इकट्ठे हुए है उन्होंने सैद्वांतिक स्तर पर एक भ्रम फैलाना चाहा है कि बड़े सैकुलरवादी है और अपने इस महान पराक्रम में उन्होंने तथाकथित सांप्रदायिक संस्था भा.ज.पा.को अछूत बना दिया है । सच्चाई यह है कि दिल्ली,मुंबई और महाराष्ट्र के नगर निगमों और नगरपालिकाओं के जो चुनाव हुए,जिनके चुनाव परिणाम अखबारों में घोषित हुए है,वे तमाम परिणाम जो इसके पहले उपचुनाव हो गए और पंजाब में चुनाव हुए उनके परिणामों को पुष्ट करते हैं । इसका एकमात्र अर्थ यह है कि भारत की जनता सांस्कृतिक राष्ट्रवाद की विचारधारा को स्वीकार करती जा रही है और भानुमती के कुनबे को पीछे छोड़ती चली जा रही है । मैं तो नहीं कहना चाहता क्योंकि मैं खुद इस शब्द पर विश्वास नहीं करता,लेकिन शायद उनको राजनीतिक दृष्टि से जनता ने अछूत बना दिया हे । मैं सिर्फ इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि यह सच्चाई उनको समझ में आनी चाहिए,जो आज सत्ता में बैठे हुए हैं वरना उन्हें इसका फल भोगना ही पड़ेगा । क्यों कि ये उठते पानी के हैं थपेड़े,पड़ेंगे मूंह पर पलट पलट के" जो अन्याय,जो गलत काम किया जाता है जब तक षडयंत्र रचकर सच्चाई को दबाने की चेष्टा की जाती है.जनता उसको अपना उत्तर देती है ।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी,राष्ट्रपति जी के व्याख्यान के संबंध में मै सिर्फ इतना कह सकता है कि उसमें भी 15 दलों की सरकार की तरह विरोधाभासी सिद्वांत,शब्दांडबर से पूर्ण बातें कही गई है,जिनका वास्तविक अर्थ कुछ भी नहीं है । यहां न्यूनतम साझा कार्यक्रम का बहुत ढिंढोरा पीटा गया है,लेकिन सच्चाई क्या है ? सरकारिया आयोग के बारे में बार-बार कहा गया कि हम उसकी बहुत सी रायें स्वीकार कर चुके है,लेकिन सच्चाई यह है कि जिस दिन दोपहर को इन लोगों ने विरोध किया अनुच्छेउ 356 का,उसी दिन शाम को सरकार ने गुजरात में चुनी सरकार को गिरा दिया । सच्चाई यह है कि आज तक कभी भी संविधान के इतिहास में ऐसा नहीं हुआ था,नये चुनाव के बाद 6 महीने बीत गए और उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रपति शासन चल रहा है । अगर यही सरकारिया आयोग की सिफारिशों को स्वीकार करना है तो इसको भी मैं इस विरोधाभासी दल की उक्ति ही मान सकता हूं । मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि इलाहाबाद उच्च न्यायालय ने इनके भ्रष्ट आचरण की भर्त्सना की है और मेरा दृढ़ विश्वास है कि सर्वोच्च न्यायालय भी इसकी पुष्टि करेगा ।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,मैं यहां यह भी स्मरण कराना चाहता हूं कि सरकारिया आयोग ने जो केन्द्र सरकार के द्वारा राज्य सरकार को आर्थिक अधिकार देने का प्रस्ताव किया था,उसके बारे में एक समिति बनाने की घोषणा इनके साझा प्रस्ताव में की गई थी,लेकिन सात महीने बीत गए और कोई ऐसी समिति नहीं बनीं । मुझे नहीं मालूम कि साझा कार्यक्रम किस तरह से यथार्थ में रूपांतरित किया जा सकता है । मैं यह भी बताना चाहता हूं कि अनुसूचित जनजातियों की स्थिति पर विचार करने के लिए जो उच्चस्तरीय समिति की नियुक्ति की बात कही गई थी,वह भी आज तक केवल बात तक केवल बात ही है । मैं यह भी बताना चाहता हूं कि एक तिहाई स्थान संसद और विधान सभाओं में जो महिलाओं को देने की बात बार-बार कहीं गई,उसको सबसे पहले मेरी पार्टी ने बड़ौदरा में घोषित किया था,उस पर भी इस भानुमति के कुनबे की सरकार के प्रधानमंत्री बार-बार लोगों को कहते है कि 15 प्रतिशत पर समझौता करो । मैं जानना चाहता हूं । कि 33 प्रतिशत से 15 प्रतिशत लाने की यह योजना किस साझा कार्यक्रम के आधार पर है ? यह मुझे नहीं मालूम,लेकिन बार-बार यह बात की जा रही है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,प्रधानमंत्री ढपोरशंखी घोषणाएं करते हैं क्योंकि इन ढपोरशंखी घोषणाओं की पूर्ति का कोई आभास उनका आचरण नहीं देता । उन्होंने उत्तराखंड राज्य के निर्माण की घोषणा की,बार-बार उत्तराखंड में गए,लेकिन आज तक उत्तराखंड राज्य का कोई प्रस्ताव नहीं हुआ । उन्होंने उत्तर पूर्व के विकास के लिए 6150 करोड़ रूपए की घोषणा की,लेकिन एक पैसा आज तक नहीं दिया गया । क्या इसी प्रकार सरकार चलती है ? क्या प्रधानमंत्री का वक्तव्य केवल एक असत्य आश्वासन होता है ? क्या प्रधानमंत्री का वक्तव्य केवल सामसिक रूप से सभा को रिझाने की बात होती है ? प्रधानमंत्री कहते है कि वह पिछड़े वर्ग पर पुनर्विचार करेंगे और जाटों को पिछड़े वर्ग में ले आएगें। यह घोषणा करते है प्रधानमंत्री जी,मगर उनका मंत्रिमंडल विरोध करता है,तो फिर वह चुप बैठ जाते है । लोकपाल बिल कैसे आएगा ? मुझे अभी नहीं मालूम,कोई उसकी घोषणा नहीं है । यह जो माननीय बालानन्दन जी बोल रहे थे,तमाम आर्थिक नीतियों की भर्त्सना और उस सरकार का समर्थन...

"इस वादे का मतलब ना समझूं,
आसान भी है,दुश्वार भी हैं,
औठों पर हंसी,अबरू पर शिकन,
इकरार भी है,इंकार भी हैं

श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वदी(राजस्थान): इस उम्र में यह आप को शोभा नहीं देता।

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: यह उन को शोभा दे रहा है,मुझे शोभा नहीं दे रहा है। जिनको शोभा दे रहा है,उन के बारे में आप कहिए। यह जो बातें है कि एक ही साथ इकरार और इंकार,एक ही साथ सरकार का समर्थन और इंकार,एक ही साथ सरकार का समर्थन और विरोध भी ,यह जो विरोधाभासी स्थितियां है,मार्क्सवादी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लिए बहुत की सुशोभन है,कांग्रेस के लिए बहुत ही सुशोभन है।

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): It is the newly formed love between the Akali Dal and the BJP.

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: हमारा पहले भी था। हम ने उन के साथ सरकार चलाई है। यह नया नहीं है,यह पुरानी दोस्ती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,राष्ट्रपति जी ने भारतीय आर्थिक स्थिति की बहुत ही सुनहरी तस्वीर पेश की है। अभी कल ही उन की सरकार का आर्थिक सर्वेक्षण निकला है और उस आर्थिक सर्वेक्षण में क्या बताया गया है ? उस में बताया गया है कि औद्योगिक वृद्वि लक्ष्य से कम हो गयी। वह 13 प्रतिशत की जगह केवल 10 प्रतिशत रह गयी आधारभूत ढांचे की कमी के कारण। लेकिन सही बात यह है कि ब्याज चुकाने की विवशता भी इस का एक बहुत बड़ा कारण है। महोदय,आर्थिक सर्वेक्षण में स्वीकार किया गया है कि निर्यात और आयात दोनों में गिरावट हुई है। आर्थिक सर्वेक्षण में बताया गया है कि पूंजी बाजार की हालत खराब है। आर्थिक सर्वेक्षण में बताया गया है कि कृषि की उपज में थोड़ी वृद्वि हुई हैं। यह वृद्वि किस सिलसिले में हुई है क्योंकि इस के पिछले साल बहुत हानि हुई थी,उस की तुलना में वृद्वि हो गयी। यह वास्तव में वृद्वि नहीं है। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कहा गया है कि मंहगाई को रोंकेंगे। अब कैसे रोकेंगे? पेट्रोलियम पदार्थो की कीमत बढ़ाने के लिए बाध्य है,यह उन के मंत्री बार-बार कहते हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,आज रेलवे मंत्रालय के भाडे 5 प्रतिशत से 10 प्रतिशत बढ़ा दिए हैं। द्वितीय श्रेणी शायिका के भी भाड़े बढ़ा दिए हैं।

श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी: नहीं बढ़ाए हैं।

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: मैं ने राम विलास पासवान जी को बोलते हुए अपने कान से सुना हैं। उन्होंने शायिका के 5 प्रतिशत भाड़े बढ़ाने का प्रस्ताव किया है। यह मैं ने अपने कान से सुना है। उन्होंने प्रथम श्रेणी,ए.सी.प्रथम श्रेणी,ए.सी.टू टियर-सब के भाड़े बढ़ाए हैं। स्लीपर क्लास के भी 5 प्रतिशत बढ़ाए हैं। माल भाड़ा बढ़ रहा है। पेट्रोल के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं।

महोदय,यह महंगाई मनुष्य को कितना असहाय बना देती हूं ? गेहूंके दाम बढ़े और ये किन के लिए बड़े ? किसानों के लिए नहीं बढ़े। गेहूं के दाम बढ़े कालाबाजारियों के लिए और इन की सरकार के कार्यकाल में बढ़े। महोदय,गेहूं की कीमतें बढ़ीं,इसलिए सब्जी की कीमत बढ़ी,इसलिए खाद्य सामग्री की कीमतें बढ़ने के लिए बाध्य हैं। यह सरकार किन के फायदे के लिए काम कर रही हैं ?

"कौनसी खाई है जिस को पाटती है कीमतें,
म्र को तेजाब बनकर चाटती है कीमतें,
दमी को पेट का चूहा बनाकर रात-दिन,
चती है,कोचती है,काटती है,कीमतें"।

यह बढ़ती हुई कीमतें,यह गरीबी की भेंट आप की सरकार की देन है। आप की सरकार एक काल्पनिक जगत में रहती है और वह नहीं जानते कि वास्तविक जगत और काल्पनिक जगत में कितना अंतर है ? महोदया,हमारे देश की क्या स्थिति है ? हिंदी के एक निडर कवि ने कहा है कि आज की स्थिति कैसी भयंकर है :-

"झील पर बादल बरसता है और हमारे देश में,
खेत पानी को तरसता है हमारे देश में,
जिंदगी का हाल खस्ता है हमारे देश में,
दूध महंगा,खून सस्ता है हमारे देश में,
अब वजीरों,अफसरों या पागलों को छोड़कर,
तुम्हीं बोलों,कौन हंसता है हमारे देश में ?"

यह जो देश है,वह कैसा है ? दूध महंगा,खून सस्ता है हमारे देश में। महोदय, माननीय गृह मंत्री जी बैठे हैं। मैं उन की जानकारी के लिए उत्तर प्रदेश का एक आंकड़ा देना चाहता हूं। उत्तर प्रदेश में जनवरी,1997 में 637 हत्याएं हुई और हत्याओं में 12 प्रतिशत वृद्वि हुई,डकैती में 38 प्रतिशत,गाड़ी लूटने की घटनाओं में 150 प्रतिशत और बलात्कार की घटनाओं में 36 प्रतिशत की वृद्वि हुई हैं।

यह सरकार सीधे जहां पर शासन कर रही है उत्तर प्रदेश में,यह वहां का एक महीने का आंकड़ा है। यहां पर मानीनय गृह मंत्री जी बैठे है,मैं यह बताना चाहता हूं कि आर्थिक स्थिति की यह जो भयंकरता है,उनका मूल कारण है भ्रष्टाचार। भ्रष्टाचार की आज कोई सीमा नहीं रह गई है और यह भ्रष्टाचार को रोकने की चेष्ठा केन्द्रीय

सरकार की तरफ से की जा रही है बार-बार,बार-बार । मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि सी.बी.आई.आखिर किसलिए काम कर रही है ? भ्रष्टाचारियों को दंडित करने के लिए या भ्रष्टाचारियों को बचाने के लिए ? बार-बार सर्वोच्च न्यायालय,बार-बार पटना उच्च न्यायाल सी.बी.आई.की भर्त्सना करता है कि तुम अपराधियों को अपराधी क्यों नहीं करार देते ? बार-बार सी.बी.आई.से मांग करता हैं कि तुम सच्चाई को सामने लाओं,क्यों देर कर रहे हो ? सी.बी.आई.पर कोई असर नहीं होता । क्योंकि सी.बी.आई.आज न्याय के लिए नहीं,अपने साथियों को डराने के लिए ब्लैक-मेल करने के लिए,कांग्रेस के बड़े-बड़े नेताओं को ब्लैक-मेल करके उनको दबाव में लाकर उनसे समर्थन पाने का माध्यम हो गई है । सी.बी.आई.इसमें तृत्त होती है कि जो भ्रष्टाचारी बिहार की सरकार है,उसकी रक्षा की जाए । मेरी पार्टी ने एक पुस्तक प्रकाशित की है "चारा चोग खज़ाना चोर",उसकी 50,000 से ज्यादा प्रतियां बिक गई और लुट गई और हमारे लालू यादव,जो हामरे देश के प्रधान ...(**व्यवधान**)....

श्री रामदेव भंडारी(बिहार)**:** आपकी पार्टी अच्छी पुस्तक तो प्रकाशित कर नहीं सकती,इस तरह की पुस्तक ही प्रकाशित करती है । अच्छी पुस्तक प्रकाशित कीजिए । **...**(**व्यवधान**)....

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: बार-बार यह कहते हैं और उनकी जनता और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी और सी.पी.एम.और माले,ये तमाम दल ....(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री रामदेव भंडारी : महोदय,यह लालू प्रसाद यादव का नाम ले रहे हैं,वह हाऊस में डिफेंड करने के लिए नहीं है । ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: मैं नाम वापिस ले लेता हूं । ...(**व्यवधान**)...आप मुख्य मंत्री कह लीजिए ।...(**व्यवधान**)...मैं नाम वापिस ले लेता हूं । ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Sir, I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I request the Memebr to yield. She has a point of order, please.

श्री मती कमला सिन्हा: इस सदन में एक प्रक्रिया जारी है । हमारे यहां परम्परा है कि जो व्यक्ति सदन में उपस्थित नहीं है,जो व्यक्ति अपने आपको डिफेंड नहीं कर सकता है,ऐसे व्यक्ति का नाम हम नहीं लेते हैं ।

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: मैं स्वीकार करता हूं ।

श्री मती कमला सिन्हा: आप बिना नाम लेकर,जिसके बारे में जो कहना है वह कहिए,लेकिन नाम न लीजिए किसी का । उसको डिलीट किया जाए,एक्सपंज किया जाए । Sir, I want your ruling.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): That is relevant to the officers and the bureaucrats, baout whom you should not talk. About political leaders, when there is a party available, which can defend the person, you can talk. When it is a political person, members of the party can defend. There should be somebody to defend.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: I beg to differ.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): You can differ.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: About a person, who is not present in the House....

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): No, it is not relev ant for the political person, who is oc cupying a post.....*(Interruptions)*....

Please wait. The point is if it is a political leader occupying a position, about whom somebody talks, then naturally there is a party which can defend him. So, you can talk. Othervise you may not be able to talk about any Chief Minister or anybody.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Sir, I give you two examples. One is the persons who has been named as a leader of a political party and the other is the person who has been named as Chief Minister of Bihar. If he is only referring to the first one, I have no objection. But, if he is talking about what is happening in Bihar.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): If he is taking as a person, that is a different matter. But, if he said about the Chief Minister of Bihar, he is a political person and he is holding a political post and there are people to defend him. So, naturally he

can talk. Of course, he cannot talk about a person in his personal capacity.

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,मैं बहुत कृतश्र हूं आपके इस निर्णय का,लेकिन मैं अपने मित्रों से सहयोग चाहता हूं क्योंकि ईमानदारी की बात कर रहा हूं।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: ईमानदारी से बताइए,जो पुस्तकें छपाई है,वह पैसा कहां से आया ? ...(**व्यवधान**)...ईमानदारी से बताइए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री नरेश यादव(बिहार)**:** आपकी सोच सामन्तवादी है,जातिवादी है,साम्प्रदायिक है,आपमें ईमानदारी बिल्कुल नहीं है। सारी बातें असत्य बोलते हैं आप। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I would request the hon. Member to please avoid controversy, because his time will go in controversy. He has got only a few minutes to go. Better avoid controversy.

श्री विष्णुकांत शास्त्री: मै आपसेयह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि बोफोर्स के कांड से 10 गुना बड़ा कांड जिन लोगों ने किया है,वैसे भ्रष्टाचारियों का समर्थन करने में इस सरकार को गौरव का अनुभव होता है। इसके लिए मैं इस सरकार को बधाई देता हूं। आप ऐसे-ऐसे मुख्यमंत्री और बनाइए,आप ऐसे-ऐसे भ्रष्टाचार के कांड और कीजिए,जनता आपको इसकी शिक्षा देगी । आप मेरा मुंह बंद कर सकते है,आप जनता का मुंह बंद नहीं कर सकते ...(**व्यवधान**)...

मित्रो,मैं एक गंभीर विषय की ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव का माननीय प्रणब मुखर्जी जी ने,कमला सिंन्हा जी ने बार-बार समर्थन किया है। बंगला देश के साथ किए गए जल-वितरण के समझौते का उन्होंने बार-बार समर्थन किया है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या इस देश में ऐसा ही होता रहेगा ? मैं भी बंगला देश के साथ समझौता करना चाहता हूं। आप में से बहुतों को मालूम नहीं है कि मैंने अपने जीवन का एक वर्ष बंगला देश की स्वाधीनता के लिए अर्पित किया है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Don't make running commentaries.

श्री विष्णुकांत शास्त्री: आप में से बहुतों को मालूम नहीं है कि मैं युद्व काल में 5 बार बंगला देश की आजादी के लिए वहां गया था और 2 आर देश की आजादी के बाद गया हूं। मेरी 3 पुस्तकें बंगला देश पर है। बंगला देश के सथ दोस्ती करने का मुझे हक है। मैंने उसके लिए अपना जीवन लगाया है लेकिन यह दोस्ती कैसे होगी ? मैं आपका स्नेह और आपका समर्थन चाहता हूं ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Please allow the Member to speak. If any Member has got any objection, he can ask for time and then speak. I would request members not to sit and make running commentaries. If any hon. Member wants to speak, he can get a time and speak. But please allow him. You can also speak because the House has been discussing the President's Address calmly.

श्री विष्णुकांत शास्त्री: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,मैं कह रहा था कि ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: आप अपनी भूमिका के बारे में कह रहे थे ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री विष्णुकातं शास्त्री: मैं कह रहा था कि बंगला देश के साथ जो समझौता हुआ है,वह समझौता कलकत्ता और हल्दिया के बंदरों की लाशों के ऊपर हुआ है। मैं इसका विरोध करता हूं। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि दुनिया में कहां ऐसा समझौता होता है कि समझौता 1996 में हो और 1996 में किए गए समझौते के लिए आंकड़ा 1988 का हो ?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): I just want to ask the hon. Member whether that kind of protest should result in attacking a train and attacking the Ministers of the duly elected Government. Would he support such a violent protest?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): He was talking about the Farakka Agreement only. He has got a right to speak.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Under the guise of protest, they created a law and order problem. They attacked trains. They attacked the Ministers.

श्री विष्णुकांत शास्त्री : बंगाल की जो बात इन्होंने कही,उस पर मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि ...(**व्यवधान**)...बंगाल के मंत्री नवाबपुत्र है क्या ? 2 आदमी 48 आदमियों की कोच को बंद करके आएंगे ...(**व्यवधान**)...शर्म आनी चाहिए,शर्म आनी चाहिए । ऐसे-ऐसे बंगाल के मंत्रियों की मैं कोई परवाह नहीं करता ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Please allow the Member to speak. The Member has got a right to speak. You should not interrupt him like this. He has got a right to express his opinion. Please allow him. He has got a right to express his opinion. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please allow him to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता(मध्य प्रदेश)**:** मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि बंगाल और केरल को छोड़कर जनता ने आपको नकार दिया है । ज्यादा बातें मत करिए । अब कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में कुछ बचा नहीं है । ज्यादा वकालत मत कीजिए ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री विष्णुकांत शास्त्री: मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि मैंने इस समझौते के लिए ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव दिया है,उस समय मैं विस्तार से इस पर चर्चा करूंगा लेकिन कुछ मुख्य बातों की ओर अभी मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं । 1996 में समझौता हुआ,अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समझौता ।

..*(Time-bell rings)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I would like to take the sense of the House. Shall we continue until the Member finishes his speech or shall we adjourn now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You can adjourn the House. ...*(Interruptions)*..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Do you want me to adjourn the House or do you want Mr. Shastri to Continue his speech? ...*(Interruptions)*..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Mr. Shastri, how much time would you take to finish your speech?

SHRI VISHNU KANT SHASTRI: I will take one hour.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): What is the sense of the House? ...*(Interruptions)*.. It is not the discretion of the speaker. Please try to understand me. It is the discretion of the House. What is the sense of the House? What is the sense of the House?

5.00 P.M.

We want to know the sense of the House? Do you want him to continue or should we adjourn?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): If he can finish in five minutes or so, we may continue.

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: नहीं,पांच मिनट में कत्म नहीं होगा । मैं इस पर एक घंटे बोलूंगा । *(Interruptions)*.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): No. The hon. Member wants a long time and he is willing to continue his speech tomorrow. Then we do not have any option. When he, says he will speak tomorrow, we cannot compel him to speak today.

The House now stands adjourned till 11 a.m. on Thursday, the 27th February, 1997.

The House then adjourned at one minute past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 27th February, 1997.